

New Operator Preserving L_p Inequalities Between Polynomials

Nisar. A. Rather and Showkat A. Zargar*

P.G.Department of Mathematics, Kashmir University, Hazratbal,

Srinagar-190006, India

e-mail: dr.narather@gmail.com

*Department of Mathematics, Degree College Ganderbal,

Ganderbal Kashmir- India

For a polynomial $P(z)$ of degree n having no zero in $|z| < 1$, it was recently asserted by Shah and Liman [17] that for every $R \geq 1$, $p \geq 1$,

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p,$$

where B is a B_n -operator with parameters $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ in the sense of Rahman and Schmeisser [15], $\Lambda_n = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \lambda_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8}$ and $\sigma(z) = Rz$, $R \geq 1$. The proof of this result is incorrect. In this paper, we present certain new L_p inequalities for B_n -operators which not only provide a correct proof of the above inequality and other related results but also extend these inequalities for $0 \leq p < 1$ as well.

1.INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS OF RESULTS

Let $\mathcal{P}_n$ denote the space of all complex polynomials $P(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j z^j$ of degree n . For $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, define

$$\|P(z)\|_0 := \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |P(e^{i\theta})| d\theta \right\},$$

$$\|P(z)\|_p := \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \right\}^{1/p}, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty,$$

$$\|P(z)\|_\infty := \max_{|z|=1} |P(z)|$$

and denote for any complex function $\psi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the composite function of P and ψ , defined by $(P \circ \psi)(z) := P(\psi(z))$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}$), as $P \circ \psi$.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification(2000): 26D10, 41A17.

Keywords and phrases: L^p inequalities, B_n -operators, polynomials.

If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then

$$\|P'(z)\|_p \leq n \|P(z)\|_p, \quad p \geq 1 \quad (1)$$

and

$$\|P(Rz)\|_p \leq R^n \|P(z)\|_p, \quad R > 1, \quad p > 0, \quad (2)$$

Inequality (1) was found out by Zygmund [18] whereas inequality (2) is a simple consequence of a result of Hardy [8]. Arestov [2] proved that (3) remains true for $0 < p < 1$ as well. For $p = \infty$, the inequality (1) is due to Bernstein (for reference, see [11,15,16]) whereas the case $p = \infty$ of inequality (2) is a simple consequence of the maximum modulus principle (see [11,12,15]). Both the inequalities (1) and (2) can be sharpened if we restrict ourselves to the class of polynomials having no zero in $|z| < 1$. In fact, if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z) \neq 0$ in $|z| < 1$, then inequalities (1) and (2) can be respectively replaced by

$$\|P'(z)\|_p \leq n \frac{\|P(z)\|_p}{\|1+z\|_p}, \quad p \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

and

$$\|P(Rz)\|_p \leq \frac{\|R^n z + 1\|_p}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p, \quad R > 1, \quad p > 0. \quad (4)$$

Inequality (3) is due to De-Bruijn [6](see also [3]) for $p \geq 1$. Rahman and Schmeisser [14] extended it for $0 < p < 1$ whereas the inequality (4) was proved by Boas and Rahman [5] for $p \geq 1$ and later it was extended for $0 < p < 1$ by Rahman and Schmeisser [14]. For $p = \infty$, the inequality (3) was conjectured by Erdős and later verified by Lax [9] whereas inequality (4) was proved by Ankeny and Rivlin [1].

As a compact generalization of inequalities (1) and (2), Aziz and Rather [4] proved that if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $R \geq 1$, and $p > 0$,

$$\|P(Rz) - \alpha P(z)\|_p \leq |R^n - \alpha| \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (5)$$

and if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z) \neq 0$ in $|z| < 1$, then for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $R \geq 1$, and $p > 0$,

$$\|P(Rz) - \alpha P(z)\|_p \leq \frac{\|(R^n - \alpha)z + (1 - \alpha)\|_p}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (6)$$

Inequality (6) is the corresponding compact generalization of inequalities (3) and (4).

Rahman [13] (see also Rahman and Schmeisser [15, p. 538]) introduced a class B_n of operators B that maps $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ into itself. That is, the operator B carries $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ into

$$B[P](z) := \lambda_0 P(z) + \lambda_1 \left(\frac{nz}{2} \right) \frac{P'(z)}{1!} + \lambda_2 \left(\frac{nz}{2} \right)^2 \frac{P''(z)}{2!} \quad (7)$$

where λ_0, λ_1 and λ_2 are such that all the zeros of

$$u(z) := \lambda_0 + C(n, 1)\lambda_1 z + C(n, 2)\lambda_2 z^2, \quad C(n, r) = n!/r!(n-r)!, \quad (8)$$

lie in the half plane

$$|z| \leq |z - n/2| \quad (9)$$

and proved that if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z)| \leq R^n |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_\infty \quad \text{for } |z| = 1. \quad (10)$$

and if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|\} \|P(z)\|_\infty \quad \text{for } |z| = 1, \quad (11)$$

(see [13, Inequality (5.2) and (5.3)]) where $\sigma(z) = Rz$, $R \geq 1$ and

$$\Lambda_n := \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \lambda_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8}. \quad (12)$$

As an extension of inequality (10) to L_p -norm, recently W.M.Shah and A.Liman [17, Theorem 1] proved that if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for every $R \geq 1$ and $p \geq 1$,

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq R^n |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_p \quad (13)$$

where $B \in B_n$ and $\sigma(z) = Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12).

While seeking the desired extension of inequality (11) to L_p -norm, they [17, Theorem 2] have made an incomplete attempt by claiming to have proved that if $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for each $R \geq 1$ and $p \geq 1$,

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (14)$$

where $B \in B_n$ and $\sigma(z) = Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12).

Further, it has been claimed to have proved the inequality (14) for self-inversive polynomials as well.

The proof of inequality (14) and other related results including the Lemma 4 in [17] given by Shah and Liman is not correct. The reason being that the authors in [17] deduce line 10 from line 7 on page 84, line 19 on page 85 from Lemma 3 [17] and line 16 from line 14 on page 86 by using the fact that if $P^*(z) := z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$, then for $\sigma(z) = Rz$, $R \geq 1$ and $|z| = 1$,

$$|B[P^* \circ \sigma](z)| = |B[(P^* \circ \sigma)^*](z)|,$$

which is not true, in general, for every $R \geq 1$ and $|z| = 1$. To see this, let

$$P(z) = a_n z^n + \cdots + a_k z^k + \cdots + a_1 z + a_0$$

be an arbitrary polynomial of degree n , then

$$P^*(z) := z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})} = \bar{a}_0 z^n + \bar{a}_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + \bar{a}_k z^{n-k} + \cdots + \bar{a}_n.$$

Now with $\mu_1 := \lambda_1 n/2$ and $\mu_2 := \lambda_2 n^2/8$, we have

$$B[P^\star \circ \rho](z) = \sum_{k=0}^n (\lambda_0 + \mu_1(n-k) + \mu_2(n-k)(n-k-1)) \bar{a}_k z^{n-k} R^{n-k},$$

and in particular for $|z| = 1$, we get

$$B[P^\star \circ \rho](z) = R^n z^n \sum_{k=0}^n (\lambda_0 + \mu_1(n-k) + \mu_2(n-k)(n-k-1)) \overline{a_k \left(\frac{z}{R}\right)^k},$$

whence

$$|B[P^\star \circ \rho](z)| = R^n \left| \sum_{k=0}^n (\lambda_0 + \mu_1(n-k) + \mu_2(n-k)(n-k-1)) a_k \left(\frac{z}{R}\right)^k \right|.$$

But

$$|B[(P^\star \circ \rho)^\star](z)| = R^n \left| \sum_{k=0}^n (\lambda_0 + \mu_1 k + \mu_2 k(k-1)) a_k \left(\frac{z}{R}\right)^k \right|,$$

so the asserted identity does not hold in general for every $R \geq 1$ and $|z| = 1$ as e.g. the immediate counterexample of $P(z) := z^n$ demonstrates in view of $P^\star(z) = 1$, $|B[P^\star \circ \rho](z)| = |\lambda_0|$ and

$$|B[(P^\star \circ \rho)^\star](z)| = |\lambda_0 + \lambda_1(n^2/2) + \lambda_2 n^3(n-1)/8|, \quad |z| = 1.$$

The main aim of this paper is to present correct proofs of the results mentioned in [17] by investigating the dependence of

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p$$

on $\|P(z)\|_p$ for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1, 0 \leq p < \infty, \sigma(z) := Rz, \rho(z) := rz$ and

$$\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) := \beta \left\{ \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^n - |\alpha| \right\} - \alpha, \quad (15)$$

and establish certain generalized L_p -mean extensions of the inequalities (10) and (11) for $0 \leq p < \infty$. In this direction, we first present the following result which is a compact generalization of the inequalities (1),(2), (5) and (10) and extends inequality (13) for $0 \leq p < 1$ as well.

Theorem 1. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \\ & \leq |R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) r^n| |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_p \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $B \in B_n, \sigma(z) := Rz, \rho(z) := rz, \Lambda_n$ and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively. The result is best possible and equality in (16) holds

for $P(z) = az^n, a \neq 0$.

A variety of interesting results can be deduced from Theorem 1 as special cases. Here we mention a few of these.

The following result follows from Theorem 1 by taking $\beta = 0$.

Corollary 1. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z) - \alpha B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \leq |R^n - \alpha r^n| |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_p \quad (17)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is best possible and equality in (17) holds for $P(z) = az^n, a \neq 0$.

Setting $\alpha = 0$ in Corollary 1, we get the following sharp result.

Corollary 2. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for $R > 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq |R^n| |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_p \quad (18)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is best possible and equality in (18) holds for $P(z) = az^n, a \neq 0$.

Remark 1. Corollary 2 not only includes inequality (13) as a special case but also extends it for $0 \leq p < 1$ as well. Further inequality (10) follows from Corollary 2 by letting $p \rightarrow \infty$ in (18).

The case $B[P](z) = P(z)$ of Theorem 1 yields the following interesting result which is a compact generalization of inequalities (1), (2) and (5).

Corollary 3. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $R > r \geq 1$, and $p > 0$,*

$$\|P(Rz) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) P(rz)\|_p \leq |R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) r^n| \|P(z)\|_p \quad (19)$$

where $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ is defined by (15). The result is best possible and equality in (19) holds for $P(z) = az^n, a \neq 0$.

Remark 2. If we divide the two sides of (19) by $R - r$ with $\alpha = 1$ and then let $R \rightarrow r$, we get for $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $r \geq 1$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\left\| zP'(rz) + \beta \frac{n}{1+r} P(rz) \right\|_p \leq n \left| r^{n-1} + \beta \frac{r^n}{1+r} \right| \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (20)$$

The result is best possible and equality in (20) holds for $P(z) = az^n, a \neq 0$.

Taking $\alpha = 0$ in (16), we obtain:

Corollary 4. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then for every real or complex number β with $|\beta| \leq 1$, $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\left\| B[P(Rz)] + \beta \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^n B[P(rz)] \right\|_p \leq \left| R^n + \beta \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^n r^n \right| |\Lambda_n| \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (21)$$

where $B \in B_n$ and $\phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ is defined by (15). The result is best possible and equality in (21) holds for $P(z) = \lambda z^n, \lambda \neq 0$.

Theorem 1 can be sharpened if we restrict ourselves to the class of polynomials $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ having no zero in $|z| < 1$. In this direction, we next present the following result which in particular includes a generalized L_p mean extension of the inequality (11) for $0 \leq p < \infty$ and among other things yields a correct proof of inequality (14) for each $p \geq 0$ as a special case.

Theorem 2. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \\ & \leq \frac{\|(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n z + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta))\lambda_0\|_p}{\|1 + z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $B \in B_n, \sigma(z) := Rz, \rho(z) := rz, \Lambda_n$ and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively. The result is best possible and equality in (22) holds for $P(z) = az^n + b, |a| = |b| \neq 0$.

For $\beta = 0$, inequality (22) reduces to the following result.

Corollary 5. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z) - \alpha B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \leq \frac{\|(R^n - \alpha r^n)\Lambda_n z + (1 - \alpha)\lambda_0\|_p}{\|1 + z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p \quad (23)$$

where $B \in B_n, \sigma(z) := Rz, \rho(z) := rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is best possible and equality in (23) holds for $P(z) = az^n + b, |a| = |b| \neq 0$.

For $\alpha = 0$, Corollary 5 yields the following interesting result.

Corollary 6. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{\|R^n \Lambda_n z + \lambda_0\|_p}{\|1 + z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p \quad (24)$$

where $B \in B_n, \sigma(z) := Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is best possible and equality in (24) holds for $P(z) = az^n + b, |a| = |b| \neq 0$.

Remark 3. If we choose $\alpha = \lambda_0 = \lambda_2 = 0$ in (24), we get for $R > 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$

$$\|P'(Rz)\|_p \leq \frac{nR^{n-1}}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p \quad (25)$$

which in particular yields inequality (3).

By making use of the triangle inequality, the following result immediately follows from Corollary 6.

Corollary 7. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for $0 \leq p < \infty$ and $R > 1$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (26)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, Λ_n is defined by (12).

Remark 4. Corollary 7 not only validates the inequality (13) for $p \geq 1$ but also extends it for $0 \leq p < 1$ as well.

A polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is said be self-inversive if $P(z) = uP^*(z)$ where $|u| = 1$ and $P^*(z)$ is the conjugate polynomial of $P(z)$, that is, $P^*(z) = z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$. Finally in this paper, we establish the following result for self-inversive polynomials which includes a correct proof of another result of Shah and Liman [17, Theorem 3] as a special case.

Theorem 3. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a self-inversive polynomial, then for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \\ & \leq \frac{\|(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n) \Lambda_n z + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)) \lambda_0\|_p}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, Λ_n and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively. The result is best possible and equality in (27) holds for $P(z) = z^n + 1$.

The following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.

Corollary 8. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a self-inversive polynomial, then for $0 \leq p < \infty$ and $R > 1$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z) - \alpha B[P \circ \rho](z)\|_p \leq \frac{\|(R^n - \alpha r^n) \Lambda_n z + (1 - \alpha) \lambda_0\|_p}{\|1+z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (28)$$

where $B \in B_n$ and $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is sharp and equality in (28) holds for $P(z) = z^n + 1$.

For $\alpha = 0$, Corollary 8 reduces to the following interesting result.

Corollary 9. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a self-inversive polynomial, then for $0 \leq p < \infty$ and $R > 1$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{\|R^n \Lambda_n z + \lambda_0\|_p}{\|1 + z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (29)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is best possible and equality in (29) holds for $P(z) = z^n + 1$.

By the triangle inequality, the following result follows immediately from Corollary 9.

Corollary 10. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a self-inversive polynomial, then for $0 \leq p < \infty$ and $R > 1$,*

$$\|B[P \circ \sigma](z)\|_p \leq \frac{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|}{\|1 + z\|_p} \|P(z)\|_p. \quad (30)$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is sharp and equality in (30) holds for $P(z) = z^n + 1$.

Remark 5. Corollary 10 establishes a correct proof of a result due to Shah and Liman [17, Theorem 3] for $p \geq 1$ and also extends it for $0 \leq p < 1$ as well.

Lastly letting $p \rightarrow \infty$ and setting $\alpha = \beta = 0$ in (27), we obtain the following result.

Corollary 10. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is a self-inversive polynomial, then for $|z| = 1$ and $R > 1$,*

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \{R^n |\Lambda_n| + |\lambda_0|\} \|P(z)\|_\infty.$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$ and Λ_n is defined by (12). The result is sharp.

2. LEMMAS

For the proofs of these theorems, we need the following lemmas. The first Lemma is easy to prove.

Lemma 1. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ has all its zeros in $|z| \leq 1$, then for every $R \geq r \geq 1$ and $|z| = 1$,*

$$|P(Rz)| \geq \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^n |P(rz)|.$$

The following Lemma follows from Corollary 18.3 of [7, p.65].

Lemma 2. *If all the zeros of polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ lie in $|z| \leq 1$, then all the zeros of the polynomial $B[P](z)$ also lie in $|z| \leq 1$.*

Lemma 3. *If $F \in \mathcal{P}_n$ has all its zeros in $|z| \leq 1$ and $P(z)$ is a polynomial of degree at most n such that*

$$|P(z)| \leq |F(z)| \text{ for } |z| = 1,$$

then for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R \geq r \geq 1$, and $|z| \geq 1$,

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](z)| \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](z)| \quad (31)$$

where $P^*(z) := z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$, $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, Λ_n and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively.

Proof of Lemma 3. Since the polynomial $F(z)$ of degree n has all its zeros in $|z| \leq 1$ and $P(z)$ is a polynomial of degree at most n such that

$$|P(z)| \leq |F(z)| \quad \text{for } |z| = 1, \quad (32)$$

therefore, if $F(z)$ has a zero of multiplicity s at $z = e^{i\theta_0}$, then $P(z)$ has a zero of multiplicity at least s at $z = e^{i\theta_0}$. If $P(z)/F(z)$ is a constant, then the inequality (31) is obvious. We now assume that $P(z)/F(z)$ is not a constant, so that by the maximum modulus principle, it follows that

$$|P(z)| < |F(z)| \quad \text{for } |z| > 1.$$

Suppose $F(z)$ has m zeros on $|z| = 1$ where $0 \leq m \leq n$, so that we can write

$$F(z) = F_1(z)F_2(z)$$

where $F_1(z)$ is a polynomial of degree m whose all zeros lie on $|z| = 1$ and $F_2(z)$ is a polynomial of degree exactly $n - m$ having all its zeros in $|z| < 1$. This implies with the help of inequality (32) that

$$P(z) = P_1(z)F_1(z)$$

where $P_1(z)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n - m$. Now, from inequality (32), we get

$$|P_1(z)| \leq |F_2(z)| \quad \text{for } |z| = 1$$

where $F_2(z) \neq 0$ for $|z| = 1$. Therefore for every real or complex number λ with $|\lambda| > 1$, a direct application of Rouché's theorem shows that the zeros of the polynomial $P_1(z) - \lambda F_2(z)$ of degree $n - m \geq 1$ lie in $|z| < 1$. Hence the polynomial

$$f(z) = F_1(z)(P_1(z) - \lambda F_2(z)) = P(z) - \lambda F(z)$$

has all its zeros in $|z| \leq 1$ with at least one zero in $|z| < 1$, so that we can write

$$f(z) = (z - te^{i\delta})H(z)$$

where $t < 1$ and $H(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $n - 1$ having all its zeros in $|z| \leq 1$. Applying Lemma 1 to the polynomial $f(z)$ with $k = 1$, we obtain for every $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(Re^{i\theta})| &= |Re^{i\theta} - te^{i\delta}||H(Re^{i\theta})| \\ &\geq |Re^{i\theta} - te^{i\delta}| \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^{n-1} |H(re^{i\theta})| \\ &= \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^{n-1} \frac{|Re^{i\theta} - te^{i\delta}|}{|re^{i\theta} - te^{i\delta}|} |(re^{i\theta} - te^{i\delta})H(re^{i\theta})| \\ &\geq \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1} \right)^{n-1} \left(\frac{R+t}{r+t} \right) |f(re^{i\theta})|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies for $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$\left(\frac{r+t}{R+t}\right) |f(Re^{i\theta})| \geq \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1}\right)^{n-1} |f(re^{i\theta})|. \quad (33)$$

Since $R > r \geq 1 > t$ so that $f(Re^{i\theta}) \neq 0$ for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ and $\frac{1+r}{1+R} > \frac{r+t}{R+t}$, from inequality (33), we obtain $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$|f(Re^{i\theta})| > \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1}\right)^n |f(re^{i\theta})|. \quad (34)$$

Equivalently,

$$|f(Rz)| > \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1}\right)^n |f(rz)|$$

for $|z| = 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$. Hence for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(Rz) - \alpha f(rz)| &\geq |f(Rz)| - |\alpha| |f(rz)| \\ &> \left\{ \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1}\right)^n - |\alpha| \right\} |f(rz)|, \quad |z| = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Also, inequality (34) can be written in the form

$$|f(re^{i\theta})| < \left(\frac{r+1}{R+1}\right)^n |f(Re^{i\theta})| \quad (36)$$

for every $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$. Since $f(Re^{i\theta}) \neq 0$ and $\left(\frac{r+1}{R+1}\right)^n < 1$, from inequality (36), we obtain for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ and $R > r \geq 1$,

$$|f(re^{i\theta})| < |f(Re^{i\theta})|.$$

Equivalently,

$$|f(rz)| < |f(Rz)| \quad \text{for } |z| = 1.$$

Since all the zeros of $f(Rz)$ lie in $|z| \leq (1/R) < 1$, a direct application of Rouché's theorem shows that the polynomial $f(Rz) - \alpha f(rz)$ has all its zeros in $|z| < 1$ for every real or complex number α with $|\alpha| \leq 1$. Applying Rouché's theorem again, it follows from (35) that for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$, all the zeros of the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} T(z) &= f(Rz) - \alpha f(rz) + \beta \left\{ \left(\frac{R+1}{r+1}\right)^n - |\alpha| \right\} f(rz) \\ &= f(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) f(rz) \\ &= (P(Rz) - \lambda F(Rz)) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) (P(rz) - \lambda F(rz)) \\ &= (P(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) P(rz)) - \lambda (F(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) F(rz)) \end{aligned}$$

lie in $|z| < 1$ for every λ with $|\lambda| > 1$. Using Lemma 2 and the fact that B is a linear operator, we conclude that all the zeros of polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} W(z) &= B[T](z) \\ &= (B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)) \\ &\quad - \lambda (B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z)) \end{aligned}$$

also lie in $|z| < 1$ for every λ with $|\lambda| > 1$. This implies

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)| \leq |B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z)| \quad (37)$$

for $|z| \geq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$. If inequality (37) is not true, then exist a point $z = z_0$ with $|z_0| \geq 1$ such that

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z_0)| > |B[F \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z_0)|.$$

But all the zeros of $F(Rz)$ lie in $|z| < 1$, therefore, it follows (as in case of $f(z)$) that all the zeros of $F(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) F(rz)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. Hence by Lemma 2, all the zeros of $B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z)$ also lie in $|z| < 1$, which shows that

$$B[F \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z_0) \neq 0.$$

We take

$$\lambda = \frac{B[P \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z_0)}{B[F \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[F \circ \rho](z_0)},$$

then λ is a well defined real or complex number with $|\lambda| > 1$ and with this choice of λ , we obtain $W(z_0) = 0$. This contradicts the fact that all the zeros of $W(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. Thus (37) holds and this completes the proof of Lemma 3.

Lemma 4. If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for arbitrary real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1, R > r \geq 1$ and $|z| \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)| \\ & \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P^* \circ \rho](z)| \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $P^*(z) := z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$, $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, and $\phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ is defined by (15).

Proof of Lemma 4. By hypothesis the polynomial $P(z)$ of degree n does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, therefore, all the zeros of the polynomial $P^*(z) = z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$ of degree n lie in $|z| \leq 1$. Applying Lemma 3 with $F(z)$ replaced by $P^*(z)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)| \\ & \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P^* \circ \rho](z)| \end{aligned}$$

for $|z| \geq 1, |\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$. This proves the Lemma 4.

Next we describe a result of Arestov[2].

For $\gamma = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ and $P(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j z^j$, we define

$$C_\gamma P(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n \gamma_j a_j z^j.$$

The operator C_γ is said to be admissible if it preserves one of the following properties:

- (i) $P(z)$ has all its zeros in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$,
- (ii) $P(z)$ has all its zeros in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq 1\}$.

The result of Arestov may now be stated as follows.

Lemma 5. [2, Th.2] *Let $\phi(x) = \psi(\log x)$ where ψ is a convex nondecreasing function on $\mathbb{R}$. Then for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and each admissible operator Λ_γ ,*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \phi(|C_\gamma P(e^{i\theta})|) d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(c(\gamma, n)|P(e^{i\theta})|) d\theta$$

where $c(\gamma, n) = \max(|\gamma_0|, |\gamma_n|)$.

In particular Lemma 5 applies with $\phi : x \rightarrow x^p$ for every $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $\phi : x \rightarrow \log x$ as well. Therefore, we have for $0 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(|C_\gamma P(e^{i\theta})|^p) d\theta \right\}^{1/p} \leq c(\gamma, n) \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \right\}^{1/p}. \quad (39)$$

From Lemma 5, we deduce the following result.

Lemma 6. *If $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, then for each $p > 0$, $R > 1$ and η real, $0 \leq \eta < 2\pi$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta}|^p d\theta \\ & \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta}))^p d\theta \\ & \leq |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}))\bar{\lambda}_0|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \end{aligned}$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, $B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) := (B[P^* \circ \sigma](z))^*$, Λ_n and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively.

Proof of Lemma 6. Since $P(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$ and $P^*(z) = z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$, by Lemma 3, we have for $R > r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](z)| \\ & \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](z)| \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Also, since

$P^*(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)P^*(rz) = R^n z^n \overline{P(1/R\bar{z})} + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n z^n \overline{P(1/r\bar{z})}$, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](z) \\ & = \lambda_0(R^n z^n \overline{P(1/R\bar{z})} + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n z^n \overline{P(1/r\bar{z})}) + \lambda_1\left(\frac{nz}{2}\right) \left(nR^n z^{n-1} \overline{P(1/R\bar{z})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R^{n-1} z^{n-2} \overline{P'(1/R\bar{z})} + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)(nr^n z^{n-1} \overline{P(1/r\bar{z})} - r^{n-1} z^{n-2} \overline{P'(1/r\bar{z})})\right) \\ & \quad + \frac{\lambda_2}{2!} \left(\frac{nz}{2}\right)^2 \left(n(n-1)R^n z^{n-2} \overline{P(1/R\bar{z})} - 2(n-1)R^{n-1} z^{n-3} \overline{P'(1/R\bar{z})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + R^{n-2} z^{n-4} \overline{P''(1/R\bar{z})} + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta)(n(n-1)r^n z^{n-2} \overline{P(1/r\bar{z})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2(n-1)r^{n-1} z^{n-3} \overline{P'(1/r\bar{z})} + r^{n-2} z^{n-4} \overline{P''(1/r\bar{z})})\right) \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z) \\
&= (B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P^* \circ \rho](z))^* \\
&= \left(\bar{\lambda}_0 + \bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8} \right) (R^n P(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^n P(z/r)) \\
&\quad - \left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2(n-1)}{4} \right) (R^{n-1} z P'(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-1} z P'(z/r)) \\
&\quad + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2}{8} (R^{n-2} z^2 P''(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-2} z^2 P''(z/r)). \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

Also, for $|z| = 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P^* \circ \rho](z)| \\
&= |B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this in (40), we get for $|z| = 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)| \\
&\leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since all the zeros of $P^*(z)$ lie in $|z| \leq 1$, as before, all the zeros of $P^*(Rz) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) P^*(rz)$ lie in $|z| < 1$ for all real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$. Hence by Lemma 2, all the zeros of $B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P^* \circ \rho](z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$, therefore, all the zeros of $B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$. Hence by the maximum modulus principle,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)| \\
&< |B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)| \quad \text{for } |z| < 1. \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

A direct application of Rouché's theorem shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\gamma P(z) &= (B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
&\quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)) \\
&= \{ (R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) r^n) \Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})) \bar{\lambda}_0 \} a_n z^n \\
&\quad + \cdots + \{ (R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^n) \bar{\Lambda}_n + e^{i\eta} (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)) \lambda_0 \} a_0
\end{aligned}$$

does not vanish in $|z| < 1$. Therefore, C_γ is an admissible operator. Applying (39) of Lemma 5, the desired result follows immediately for each $p > 0$.

From Lemma 6, we deduce the following more general result.

Lemma 7. *If $P \in P_n$, then for every $p > 0$, $R > 1$ and η real, $0 \leq \eta < 2\pi$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})) e^{i\eta} \\
&\quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta}))|^p d\theta \\
&\leq |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) r^n) \Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})) \bar{\lambda}_0|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta
\end{aligned}$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, $B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) := (B[P^* \circ \sigma](z))^*$, Λ_n and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively.

Proof of Lemma 7. If all the zeros of $P(z)$ lie in $|z| \geq 1$, then the result follows by Lemma 6. Henceforth, we assume that $P(z)$ has at least one zero in $|z| < 1$ so that we can write

$$P(z) = P_1(z)P_2(z) = a \prod_{j=1}^k (z - z_j) \prod_{j=k+1}^n (z - z_j), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \quad a \neq 0$$

where all the zeros of $P_1(z)$ lie in $|z| \geq 1$ and all the zeros of $P_2(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. First we assume that $P_1(z)$ has no zero on $|z| = 1$ so that all the zeros of $P_1(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$. Let $P_2^*(z) = z^{n-k} \overline{P_2(1/\bar{z})}$, then all the zeros of $P_2^*(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$ and $|P_2^*(z)| = |P_2(z)|$ for $|z| = 1$. Now consider the polynomial

$$f(z) = P_1(z)P_2^*(z) = a \prod_{j=1}^k (z - z_j) \prod_{j=k+1}^n (1 - z\bar{z}_j),$$

then all the zeros of $f(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$ and for $|z| = 1$,

$$|f(z)| = |P_1(z)| |P_2^*(z)| = |P_1(z)| |P_2(z)| = |P(z)|. \quad (43)$$

Therefore, it follows by Rouché's theorem that the polynomial $g(z) = P(z) + \mu f(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$ for every μ with $|\mu| > 1$, so that all the zeros of $g(z)$ lie in $|z| \geq \delta$ for some $\delta > 1$ and hence all the zeros of $T(z) = g(\delta z)$ lie in $|z| \geq 1$. Applying (42) and (41) to the polynomial $T(z)$, we get for $R > 1$ and $|z| < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[T \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[T \circ \rho](z)| \\ & < |B[T^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[T^* \circ \rho]^*(z)| \\ & = \left| \left(\bar{\lambda}_0 + \bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8} \right) (R^n T(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^n T(z/r)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2(n-1)}{4} \right) (R^{n-1} z T'(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-1} z T'(z/r)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2}{8} (R^{n-2} z^2 T''(z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-2} z^2 T''(z/r)) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[T \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[T \circ \rho](z)| \\ & = \left| \left(\bar{\lambda}_0 + \bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8} \right) (R^n g(\delta z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^n g(\delta z/r)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2(n-1)}{4} \right) (R^{n-1} \delta z g'(\delta z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-1} \delta z g'(\delta z/r)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2}{8} (R^{n-2} \delta^2 z^2 g''(\delta z/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-2} \delta^2 z^2 g''(\delta z/r)) \right| \end{aligned}$$

for $|z| < 1$. If $z = e^{i\theta}/\delta, 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, then $|z| = (1/\delta) < 1$ as $\delta > 1$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[T \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}/\delta) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[T \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}/\delta)| \\
&= \left| \left(\bar{\lambda}_0 + \bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8} \right) (R^n g(e^{i\theta}/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^n g(e^{i\theta}/r)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\bar{\lambda}_1 \frac{n}{2} + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2(n-1)}{4} \right) (R^{n-1} e^{i\theta} g'(e^{i\theta}/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-1} e^{i\theta} g'(e^{i\theta}/r)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{\lambda}_2 \frac{n^2}{8} (R^{n-2} e^{2i\theta} g''(e^{i\theta}/R) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) r^{n-2} e^{2i\theta} g''(e^{i\theta}/r)) \right| \\
&= |B[g^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[g^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently for $|z| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[g \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[g \circ \rho](z)| \\
&\quad < |B[g^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[g^* \circ \rho]^*(z)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since all the zeros of $g(z)$ lie in $|z| \geq 1$, all the zeros of $g^*(z) = z^n \overline{g(1/\bar{z})}$ lie in $|z| \leq 1$ and hence as before, all the zeros of $g^*(Rz) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) g^*(rz)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. By Lemma 2, all the zeros of $B[g^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[g^* \circ \rho](z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$ and therefore, all the zeros of $B[g^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[g^* \circ \rho]^*(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$. Thus

$$B[g^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[g^* \circ \rho]^*(z) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } |z| \leq 1.$$

An application of Rouché's theorem shows that the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}
M(z) = & (B[g \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[g \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
& + B[g^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[g^* \circ \rho]^*(z)
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$. Replacing $g(z)$ by $P(z) + \mu f(z)$ and noting that B is a linear operator, it follows that the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}
M(z) = & (B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
& + (B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)) \\
& + \mu ((B[f \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[f \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
& + (B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z)))
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$ for every μ with $|\mu| > 1$.

We claim

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)| \\
& \leq |(B[f \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[f \circ \rho](z)) e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z)|
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

for $|z| \leq 1$. If inequality (46) is not true, then there a point $z = z_0$ with $|z_0| \leq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(B[P \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[P \circ \rho](z_0)) e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z_0)| \\
& > |(B[f \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta) B[f \circ \rho](z_0)) e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z_0)|
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$, proceeding similarly as in the proof of (44), it follows that the polynomial

$$(B[f \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[f \circ \rho](z))e^{i\eta} + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z)$$

does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$. Hence

$$(B[f \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[f \circ \rho](z_0))e^{i\eta} + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z_0) \neq 0.$$

We take

$$\mu = -\frac{(B[P \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](z_0))e^{i\eta} + B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z_0)}{(B[f \circ \sigma](z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[f \circ \rho](z_0))e^{i\eta} + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(z_0) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(z_0)}$$

so that μ is well-defined real or complex number with $|\mu| > 1$ and with this choice of μ , from (45), we get $M(z_0) = 0$. This clearly is a contradiction to the fact that $M(z)$ does not vanish in $|z| \leq 1$. Thus (46) holds, which in particular gives for each $p > 0$ and η real,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ & \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[f \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[f \circ \rho](z))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + B[f^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[f^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Using Lemma 7 and (43), we get for each $p > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ & \leq |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}))\bar{\lambda}_0|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |f(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ & = |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}))\bar{\lambda}_0|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Now if $P_1(z)$ has a zero on $|z| = 1$, then applying (48) to the polynomial $Q(z) = P_1(tz)P_2(z)$ where $t < 1$, we get for each $p > 0$, $R > r \geq 1$ and η real,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[Q \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[Q \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + (B[Q^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[Q^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta}))|^p d\theta \\ & \leq |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}))\bar{\lambda}_0|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |Q(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Letting $t \rightarrow 1$ in (49) and using continuity, the desired result follows immediately and this proves Lemma 7.

Lemma 8. *If $P \in P_n$ and $P^*(z) = z^n \overline{P(1/\bar{z})}$, then for every $p > 0$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))|^p d\theta \\
& \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta))\lambda_0|^p d\eta \\
& \quad \times \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where $B \in B_n$, $\sigma(z) := Rz$, $\rho(z) := rz$, Λ_n and $\phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (12) and (15) respectively. The result is best possible and the extremal polynomial is $P(z) = \beta z^n$, $\beta \neq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 8. Since $B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(z) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(z)$ is the conjugate polynomial of $B[P^* \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](z)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})| \\
& = |B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|, \quad 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore for each $p > 0$, $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))|^p d\eta \\
& = \int_0^{2\pi} ||B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + |B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})||^p d\eta \\
& = \int_0^{2\pi} ||B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + |B[P^* \circ \sigma]^*(e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho]^*(e^{i\theta})||^p d\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Integrating both sides of (51) with respect to θ from 0 to 2π and using Lemma

7, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))|^p d\eta d\theta \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} ||B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|e^{i\eta} \\
& \quad + |B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})||^p d\eta d\theta \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\int_0^{2\pi} (B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})) \right)^p d\theta \Big) d\eta \\
&\leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}))\bar{\lambda}_0|^p d\eta \\
& \quad \times \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\
&\leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta))\lambda_0|^p d\eta \\
& \quad \times \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 8.

3. PROOFS OF THE THEOREMS

Proof of Theorem 1. By hypothesis $P \in P_n$, we can write

$$P(z) = P_1(z)P_2(z) = c \prod_{j=1}^k (z - z_j) \prod_{j=k+1}^n (z - z_j), \quad k \geq 1, c \neq 0$$

where all the zeros of $P_1(z)$ lie in $|z| \leq 1$ and all the zeros of $P_2(z)$ lie in $|z| > 1$. First we suppose that all the zeros of $P_1(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. Let $P_2^*(z) = z^{n-k} \overline{P_2(1/\bar{z})}$, then all the zeros of $P_2^*(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$ and $|P_2^*(z)| = |P_2(z)|$ for $|z| = 1$. Now consider the polynomial

$$F(z) = P_1(z)P_2^*(z) = c \prod_{j=1}^k (z - z_j) \prod_{j=k+1}^n (1 - z\bar{z}_j),$$

then all the zeros of $F(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$ and for $|z| = 1$,

$$|F(z)| = |P_1(z)| |P_2^*(z)| = |P_1(z)| |P_2(z)| = |P(z)|. \quad (52)$$

Observe that $P(z)/F(z) \rightarrow 1/\prod_{j=k+1}^n (-\bar{z}_j)$ when $z \rightarrow \infty$, so it is regular even at ∞ and thus from (52) and by the maximum modulus principle, it follows that

$$|P(z)| \leq |F(z)| \quad \text{for } |z| \geq 1.$$

Since $F(z) \neq 0$ for $|z| \geq 1$, a direct application of Rouché's theorem shows that the polynomial $H(z) = P(z) + \lambda F(z)$ has all its zeros in $|z| < 1$ for every λ with $|\lambda| > 1$. Therefore, for all real or complex numbers α, β with $|\alpha| \leq 1, |\beta| \leq 1$ and $R > r \geq 1$, it follows that all the zeros of $h(z) = H(Rz) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)H(rz)$ lie in $|z| < 1$. Applying Lemma 2 to the polynomial $h(z)$ and noting that B is a linear operator, it follows that all the zeros of

$$\begin{aligned} B[h](z) &= B[H \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[H \circ \rho](z) \\ &= B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](z) \\ &\quad + \lambda(B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F \circ \rho](z)) \end{aligned}$$

lie in $|z| < 1$ for every λ with $|\lambda| > 1$. This implies

$$|B[P \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](z)| \leq |B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F \circ \rho](z)|$$

for $|z| \geq 1$, which, in particular, gives for each $p > 0$, $R > r \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{2\pi} |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ &\leq \int_0^{2\pi} |B[F \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Again, since all the zeros of $F(z)$ lie in $|z| < 1$, it follows, as before, that all the zeros of $B[F(Rz)] + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F(rz)]$ also lie in $|z| < 1$. Therefore, if $F(z) = b_n z^n + b_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots + b_0$, then the operator C_γ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C_\gamma F(z) &= B[F \circ \sigma](z) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F \circ \rho](z) \\ &= (R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \lambda_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8})b_n z^n + \dots + \lambda_0 b_0 \end{aligned}$$

is admissible. Hence by (39) of Lemma 5, for each $p > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{2\pi} |B[F \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[F \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ &\leq |R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n| |\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \frac{n^2}{2} + \lambda_2 \frac{n^3(n-1)}{8}|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |F(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Combining inequalities (53) and (54) and noting that $|F(e^{i\theta})| = |P(e^{i\theta})|$, we obtain for each $p > 0$ and $R > r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{2\pi} |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \\ &\leq |R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n| |\Lambda_n| \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

In case $P_1(z)$ has a zero on $|z| = 1$, then the inequality (55) follows by continuity. To obtain this result for $p = 0$, we simply make $p \rightarrow 0+$.

Proof of Theorem 2. By hypothesis $P \in P_n$ does not vanish in $|z| < 1$, $\sigma(z) = Rz$, $\rho(z) = rz$ therefore, if $P^*(z) = z^n P(1/\bar{z})$, then by Lemma 3, we

have for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})| \\ & \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})| \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Also, by Lemma 8, for each $p > 0$ and η real and $R > r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))|^p d\theta d\eta \\ & \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta))\lambda_0|^p d\eta \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Now it can be easily verified that for every real number α and $s \geq 1$,

$$|s + e^{i\alpha}| \geq |1 + e^{i\alpha}|.$$

This implies for each $p > 0$,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |s + e^{i\alpha}|^p d\alpha \geq \int_0^{2\pi} |1 + e^{i\alpha}|^p d\alpha. \quad (57)$$

If $B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}) \neq 0$, we take

$$s = \frac{|B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|}{|B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|},$$

then by (56), $s \geq 1$ and from (57), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |(B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))e^{i\eta} \\ & \quad + (B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}))|^p d\eta \\ & = |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p \\ & \quad \times \int_0^{2\pi} \left| e^{i\eta} + \frac{B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})}{B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})} \right|^p d\eta \\ & = |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p \\ & \quad \times \int_0^{2\pi} \left| e^{i\eta} + \frac{B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})}{B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})} \right|^p d\eta \\ & \geq |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p \int_0^{2\pi} |1 + e^{i\eta}|^p d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

For $B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta}) = 0$, this inequality is trivially

true. Using this in (50), we conclude that for each $p > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{2\pi} |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} |1 + e^{i\eta}|^p d\eta \\ & \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |(R^n + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)r^n)\Lambda_n e^{i\eta}| \\ & \quad + (1 + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta))\lambda_0|^p d\eta \int_0^{2\pi} |P(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

from which theorem 2 follows for $p > 0$. To establish this result for $p = 0$, we simply let $p \rightarrow 0+$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 3. Since $P \in P_n$ is self-inversive polynomial, we have for some u with $u=1$, $P^*(z) = uP(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ where $P^*(z) = z^n P(1/\bar{z})$. This gives for $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |B[P \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})| \\ & \leq |B[P^* \circ \sigma](e^{i\theta}) + \phi_n(R, r, \alpha, \beta)B[P^* \circ \rho](e^{i\theta})|. \end{aligned}$$

Using this in (50) and proceeding similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2, we get the desired result for each $p > 0$. To extension to $p = 0$ is obtains by letting $p \rightarrow 0+$.

References

- [1] **N.C. Ankeny and T.J.Rivlin**, *On a theorm of S.Bernstein*, Pacific J. Math., **5**(1955),849 - 852.
- [2] **V.V.Arestov**, *On integral inequalities for trigonometric polynimials and their derivatives*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **45** (1981),3-22[in Russian]. English translation; Math.USSR-Izv.,**18** (1982),1-17.
- [3] **A.Aziz**, *A new proof and a generalization of a theorem of De Bruijn*, proc. Amer Math. Soc., **106**(1989),345-350.
- [4] **A. Aziz and N.A. Rather**, *Some compact generalizations of Zygmund-type inequalities for polynomials*, Nonlinear Studies, **6**(1999), 241 - 255.
- [5] **R.P.Boas,Jr. and Q.I.Rahman** , *L^p inequalities for polynomials and entire functions*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **11**(1962),34-39.
- [6] **N.G.Bruijn**, *Inequalities concerning polynomials in the complex domain*,Nederal. Akad.Wetensch. Proc.,**50**(1947),1265-1272.
- [7] **K.K.Dewan and N.K.Govil**, *An inequality for self- inversive polynomials*, J.Math. Anal. Appl.,**45**(1983), 490.
- [8] **G.H.Hardy**, *The mean value of the modulus of an analytic functions* , Proc. London Math. Soc., **14**(1915), 269-277.

- [9] **P.D.Lax**, *Proof of a conjecture of P.Erdős on the derivative of a polynomial*, Bull. Amer. Math.Soc.,**50**(1944),509-513.
- [10] **M.Marden**, *Geometry of polynomials*, Math. Surveys, No.**3**, Amer. Math.Soc. Providence, RI, 1949.
- [11] **G.V.Milovanovic,D.S.Mitrinovic and Th.M.Rassias**, *Topics in Polynomials: Extremal Properties, Inequalities, Zeros*, World scientific Publishing Co., Singapore,(1994).
- [12] **G.Polya and G.Szegő**, *Aufgaben und lehrsätze aus der analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin(1925).
- [13] **Q.I.Rahman**, *Functions of exponential type*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **135**(1969),295-309.
- [14] **Q.I.Rahman and G.Schmeisser**, *L^p inequalities for polynomials*, J. Approx. Theory,**53**(1988),26-32.
- [15] **Q.I.Rahman and G.Schmisser**, *Analytic Theory of Polynomials*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.
- [16] **A.C.Schaffer**, *Inequalities of A.Markov and S.Bernstein for polynomials and related functions*, Bull.Amer. Math. Soc., **47**(1941), 565-579.
- [17] **W.M.Shah and A.Liman**, *Integral estimstes for the family of B-operators*, Operators and Matrices, **5**(2011), 79-87.
- [18] **A. Zygmund**, *A remark on conjugate series*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **34**(1932),292-400.